FILED IN THE
U.S. DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON

DEC 2 6 2018

SEAN F. McAVOY, CLERK
DEPUTY
SPOKANE, WASHINGTON

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON

JOHN SCHLABACH.

Case No.: 2:18-cv-00053-SMJ

Plaintiff,

VS.

UNITED STATES.

Defendant

REPLY TO GOVERNMENTS OPPOTITION TO MOTION FOR PARTIAL RELIEF FROM ORDER, PURSUANT TO RULE 60

I herein respond to the opposition filed by the government. Reviewing the record, I should not have to say anything just as the government didn't have to say anything on the initial filing. The court reviewed the record and determined I failed to follow the rule 4 service mandates and denied my motion for default.

In the court's ruling it ignored the lack evidence in this case in making its ruling.

THE GOVERNMENTS OPPOSITION DOES NOT DENIAL THE BURDEN OF PROOF IS THE IRS. BURDEN OF PROOF

The legal mandate that the burden, relative to penalties, is on the government and the government is not opposed and there is no opposition to the motion. Therefore, the court need only review the record for evidence to support the allegations of a frivolous filing. If there is no such evidence, then pursuant to the complaint and relief requested the court must also rule there is no evidence of a frivolous filing presented by the government and must therefore also rule that the penalties must be denied.

Definition(s) of burden of proof; Duhaime's Law Dictionary

"Burden of proof has two distinct meanings; that generally the burden of proof, in the sense of producing evidence, passes from party to party as the case

MOTION FOR RELIEF FROM ORDER - PAGE 1 OF 4

1

3

4 5

6

, ||

7

8

10

11

12

13

14 15

16

17 18

19

2021

22

2324

25

26

27

28

progresses, while the burden of proof in the sense of the obligation to establish the truth of the claim by a preponderance of the evidence rests throughout upon the party asserting the affirmative of the issue, and that, in the contest of a will, the burden of proof is on the proponent to prove the will."

Legal Dictionary Definition of Burden of Proof

Noun

1. The obligation to present evidence to the court or jury to prove one's case.

Burden Of Proof - FindLaw Legal Dictionary

https://dictionary.findlaw.com/definition/burden-of-proof.html

"the responsibility of producing sufficient evidence in support of a fact or issue and favorably persuading the trier of fact (as a judge or jury) regarding that fact"

The question I have is where is this evidence? This is not only a surprise; the judicial machinery has failed. The court committed clear error. It is Unconscionable the massive misrepresentations through the court system that was perpetrated in this case. The court had to slander, be biased, perpetrate the unsubstantiated, unfounded statements and rule clearly contrary to the facts of the case to reach its decision.

ARGUMENT

If the court wanted to be fair it would have ruled the same way it did at the onset when it denied my motion for default. It simply ruled there was no evidence the local attorney was served and therefore denied the motion for default. In ruling on the governments motion it ruled the opposite, making finding contrary to any evidence. It should have ruled as to the

penalties the burden is on the government and there being no evidence to support the allegations of filing frivolous documentation deny the penalties.

The governments opposition is nonsensical and non-responsive to the motion for relief from the order. There is no denial the burden is on them, nor that there is no evidence to support any penalty for any of the years. There is no denial that the slanderous, radical and racist remarks made by the court are unfounded, biased and clearly an error by the court to make any such arguments or statements.

I don't have to say anything as the **only** facts in the record from the government is clearly perjured, no evidence to support the allegations of a frivolous filing nor of making any such determination as provided by statute and outlined by the secretary of the treasury.

The government did not deny that the outlandish claims made by the court are clearly incorrect radical, racist and prejudicial.

Fraud on the Court Law and Legal Definition

Fraud on the court occurs when the judicial machinery itself has been tainted, such as when an attorney, who is an officer of the court, is involved in the perpetration of a fraud or makes material misrepresentations to the court or the court itself. Fraud upon the court makes void the orders and judgments of that court.

In Bulloch v. United States, 763 F.2d 1115, 1121 (10th Cir. 1985), the court stated "Fraud upon the court is fraud which is directed to the judicial machinery itself and is not fraud between the parties or fraudulent documents, false statements or perjury. ... It is where the court or a member is corrupted or influenced or influence is attempted or where the judge has not performed his judicial function --- thus where the impartial functions of the court have been directly corrupted."

What is Fraud on the Court?

Fraud on the Court, or Fraud upon the Court, is where a material misrepresentation has been made to the court, or by the court itself. The main requirement is that the impartiality of the court has been so disrupted that it can't perform its tasks without bias or prejudice.

All the cased in the 9th circuit court demand facts and evidence from the party that has the burden of proof. There are no facts from the secretary, nor are there any determination, in the cited rulings that demanding a redemption pursuant to 12 USC 411 is frivolous.

WHEREFORE, the government opposition does not deny the burden therefore agrees with the motion for relief as to the burden. The court can easily review the record and find there are no facts or evidence to support the burden as to any penalties, the court must reconsider the ruling on the penalties and remove the slanderous, unfounded statements and racist remarks and deny any penalties.

Dated this 23rd day of December, 2018.

John Selrlabach

PO Box 362

Mead, Washington 99021 johnjsch@gmail.com

509-953-1060

	1	
1		
2		
3		
4		
5	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
6	EASTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON	
7 8	JOHN SCHLABACH,	Case No.: 2:18-cv-00053-SMJ
9	Plaintiff,	
10	vs. INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE AND ITS AGENTS,	CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE OF REPLY TO GOVERNMENTS OPPOTITION TO MOTION FOR PARTIAL RELIEF FROM ORDER, PURSUANT TO
11	Defendant	RULE 60
12 13	I hereby certify under penalty of perjury that I served a true and correct copy of the	
14	foregoing " REPLY TO GOVERNMENTS OPPOTITION TO MOTION FOR PARTIAL RELIEF FROM	
15	ORDER, PURSUANT TO rule 60" on the defendants' attorney by depositing the copy with the US	
16	postal service, postage prepaid, personal delivery	, addressed to the following.
17		
18	RIKA VALDMAN	
19	Trial Attorney, Tax Division U.S. Department of Justice	
20	P.O. Box 683	
	Washington, D.C. 20044	
21 22	United States Attorneys Office	
23	PO Box 1494	
23 24	Spokane, Washington 99210-1494	
2 4 25		
26	Dated this 23 day of December, 2018	
20 27	Dated tills and di Decelliber, 2016	
28		
_0	John Schlabach	<u> </u>